



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,166	03/10/2004	Johan Thevelein	Q80427	3449
23373	7590	03/20/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				JOIKE, MICHELE K
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1636		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		03/20/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/796,166	THEVELEIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHELE K. JOIKE	1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9,10,12,14-23,38 and 40-62 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-6,42 and 44-47 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 38, 40-41 and 48-62 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 43 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 9, 2008 has been entered.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-23, 38 and 40-62 are pending; claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 38 and 40-62 are under consideration in the instant application. Any rejection of record in the previous Office Action, mailed December 13, 2006 that is not addressed in this action has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 9 and 43 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 9, line 2, "cerevisia" should be "cerevisiae". In claim 43, the "t" at the end of line 2 should be "at". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 38, 40-41 and 48-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant claims yeast strains obtained by the process claimed in claim 1. The claims read on a broad genus of yeast strains, because any industrial, brewery or baker's yeast strain with the fil phenotype made by the process in claim 1 is encompassed by the claims.

The written description requirement for a genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e. structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show applicants were in possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case, the specification does not sufficiently describe a representative number of yeast strains made by actual reduction to practice or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics.

Applicant claims the yeast strains by function only, without any disclosed or known correlation between the elements and their function. The specification only provides teachings of a few strains made. The specification does not teach how to make any yeast strain with a fil phenotype. More than one mutation is known to cause

a fil phenotype, and there is no guidance on all the different genes that can be mutated to produce a yeast strain with the fil phenotype. There is no evidence that there is any *per se* structure/function relationship between the disclosed strains and any others that might be made using the claimed method. The skilled artisan cannot envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention from the instant specification because the specification only discloses a few yeast strains with specific mutations.

The state of the art at the time of filing does not provide sufficient information on the subject to overcome the deficiencies of the instant specification. There is no description in the art that allows one to envision a representative number of yeast strains with the fil phenotype by disclosing structural or functional features of the yeast strains so that one of skill in the art could envision the claimed invention. Thus the skilled artisan cannot consult the art at the time of filing to envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention to see that the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Neither the specification of the instant application or the state of the art at the time of filing teaches a structure-function relationship for a representative number of yeast strains with the fil phenotype. As a result, the skilled artisan would not be able to envision the claimed invention. Therefore applicant has not satisfied the written description requirement to show the skilled artisan that they were in possession of the claimed genus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7, 9, 38, 40, 41, 51 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al.

Applicants claim an industrial, brewery, or baker's yeast strain with the fil phenotype, including a *S. cerevisiae* strain, made by the process in claim 1. These are product-by process claims. The “fil phenotype” is a yeast strain that keeps good stress resistance in fermentation and/or growth phase (p. 1specification).

Kim et al (Appl. and Envtl. Micro. 62(5): 1563-1569, 1996, specifically p. 1563) teaches a *S. cerevisiae* strain with a deletion in the ATH gene, which allowed for increased tolerance to stress conditions of dehydration, freezing and toxic levels of ethanol. *S. cerevisiae* is used in brewing and baking.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6, 42 and 44-47 are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHELE K. JOIKE whose telephone number is (571)272-5915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michele K Joike, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1636

/David Guzo/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1636